Joshua B. Swigart, Esq. (SBN: 225557) josh@westcoastlitigation.com

Tiffany G. Jensen, Esq. (SBN: 256842)

tiffany@westcoastlitigation.com

Hyde & Swigart

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

v.

HYDE & SWIGART San Diego, California

411 Camino Del Rio South, Suite 301

San Diego, CA 92108-3551

Telephone: (619) 233-7770 Facsimile: (619) 297-1022

Attorneys for the Plaintiffs Mark and Lori Roberts

O9 MAR 23 PM 1: 11

SUFFRENCH STRICT OF CALLEDNAL

DEPUTY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mark and Lori Roberts

Plaintiffs,

Case Number: 09 CV 0 578

Complaint For Damages

Jury Trial Demanded

Defendant.

CMRE Financial Services

Introduction

1. The United States Congress has found abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors, and has determined that abusive debt collection practices contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy. Congress wrote the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. (hereinafter "FDCPA"), to eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors,

- to insure that those debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses.
- 2. The California legislature has determined that the banking and credit system and grantors of credit to consumers are dependent upon the collection of just and owing debts and that unfair or deceptive collection practices undermine the public confidence that is essential to the continued functioning of the banking and credit system and sound extensions of credit to consumers. The Legislature has further determined that there is a need to ensure that debt collectors exercise this responsibility with fairness, honesty and due regard for the debtor's rights and that debt collectors must be prohibited from engaging in unfair or deceptive acts or practices.
- 3. Mark and Lori Roberts, (Plaintiffs), through Plaintiffs' attorneys, bring this action to challenge the actions of CMRE Financial Services, ("Defendant"), with regard to attempts by Defendant to unlawfully and abusively collect a debt allegedly owed by Plaintiffs, and this conduct caused Plaintiffs damage.
- 4. Plaintiffs make these allegations on information and belief, with the exception of those allegations that pertain to a plaintiff, or to a plaintiff's counsel, which Plaintiffs allege on personal knowledge.
- 5. Unless otherwise stated, Plaintiffs allege that any violations by Defendant were knowing and intentional, and that Defendant did not maintain procedures reasonably adapted to avoid any such violation.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 6. Jurisdiction of this Court arises pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, 15 U.S.C. § 1692(k), and 28 U.S.C. § 1367 for supplemental state claims.
- 7. This action arises out of Defendant's violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA") and the Rosenthal Fair

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Debt	Collection	Practices	Act,	California	Civil	Code	§§	1788-1788.32
("RFI	OCPA").							

- Because Defendant does business within the State of California, personal 8. jurisdiction is established.
- Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391. 9.

PARTIES

- Plaintiffs are natural persons who reside in the City of San Diego, County of 10. San Diego, State of California.
- Defendant is located in the City of Brea, the County of Orange, and the State 11. of California.
- Plaintiffs are obligated or allegedly obligated to pay a debt, and are 12. "consumers" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
- Defendant is a person who uses an instrumentality of interstate commerce or 13. the mails in a business the principal purpose of which is the collection of debts, or who regularly collects or attempts to collect, directly or indirectly, debts owed or due or asserted to be owed or due another and is therefore a debt collector as that phrase is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).
- Plaintiffs are natural persons from whom a debt collector sought to collect a 14. consumer debt which was due and owing or alleged to be due and owing from Plaintiffs, and are "debtors" as that term is defined by California Civil Code § 1788.2(h).
- Defendant, in the ordinary course of business, regularly, on behalf of himself, 15. herself, or others, engages in debt collection as that term is defined by California Civil Code § 1788.2(b), is therefore a debt collector as that term is defined by California Civil Code § 1788.2(c).
- 26 //
- 27 //

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

27

28

This case involves money, property or their equivalent, due or owing or 16. alleged to be due or owing from a natural person by reason of a consumer credit transaction. As such, this action arises out of a consumer debt and "consumer credit" as those terms are defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.2(f).

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- At all times relevant to this matter, Plaintiffs were individuals residing within 17. the State of California.
- 18. At all times relevant, Defendant conducted business within the State of California.
- 19. Sometime before January 16, 2008, Plaintiffs are alleged to have incurred certain financial obligations.
- These financial obligations were primarily for personal, family or household 20. purposes and are therefore a "debt" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(5).
- These alleged obligations were money, property, or their equivalent, which is 21. due or owing, or alleged to be due or owing, from a natural person to another person and are therefore a "debt" as that term is defined by California Civil Code §1788.2(d), and a "consumer debt" as that term is defined by California Civil Code §1788.2(f).
- Sometime thereafter, but before January 16, 2008, Plaintiffs allegedly fell 22. behind in the payments allegedly owed on the alleged debt. **Plaintiffs** currently dispute the validity of this alleged debt.
- Subsequently, but before January 16, 2008, the alleged debt was assigned, 23. placed, or otherwise transferred, to Defendant for collection.
- On or about January 16, 2008, Defendant mailed a dunning letter to Plaintiffs. 25 24. A few days later, Plaintiffs received that letter. 26

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

22

- 25. This communication to Plaintiffs was a "communication" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2), and an "initial communication" consistent with 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a).
- 26. This communication was a "debt collection" as Cal. Civ. Code 1788.2(b) defines that phrase, and an "initial communication" consistent with Cal. Civ. Code § 1812.700(b).
- This January 16, 2008 letter included the language necessary to meet the 27. requirements of 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(b).
- 28. On or about February 10, 2008, Plaintiffs sent a letter to Defendant in which Plaintiff disputed the validity the debt in a manner consistent with the requirements in 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(b).
- Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Defendant 29. received Plaintiffs dispute letter on February 13, 2008, well within Plaintiffs' 30 day dispute period.
- On or about April 3, 2008, Defendant filed a lawsuit in The Superior Court of 30. California, County of San Diego, Case number 37-2008-00052877-CL-CL-NC, in an attempt to collect the alleged debt.
- On or about April 17, 2008, Plaintiffs were served a Summons and Complaint 18 31. 19 for Case number 37-2008-00052877-CL-CL-NC.
 - By sending this communication, and demand for payment, before validating 32. the debt as required pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(b), Defendant violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g.
- By sending the above communications, Defendant acted in a manner that was 23 33. deceptive, unfair, and unconscionable, thereby violating 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692e, 24 25 1692e(10) and 1692f.
- Because these April 3, 2008 and April 17, 2008 communications did not 26 34. 27 comply with certain provisions of the FDCPA including, but not limited to, 15

28

San Diego, California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

U.S.C. §§ 1692e, 1692e(10), 1692f, and 1692g, these communications also violated Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.17.

CAUSES OF ACTION

COUNT I

VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692 ET SEQ.

- Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all of the above paragraphs of this 35. Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- The foregoing acts and omissions constitute numerous and multiple violations 36. of the FDCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the abovecited provisions of the FDCPA, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq.
- As a result of each and every violation of the FDCPA, Plaintiffs are entitled to 37. any actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1); statutory damages in an amount up to \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A); and, reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) from Defendant.

COUNT II

VIOLATIONS OF THE ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT CAL. CIV. CODE §§ 1788-1788.32

- Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all of the above paragraphs of this 38. Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- The foregoing acts and omissions constitute numerous and multiple violations 39. of the RFDCPA.
- As a result of each and every violation of the RFDCPA, Plaintiffs are entitled 40. to any actual damages pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(a); statutory damages for a knowing or willful violation in the amount up to \$1,000.00 pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(b); and reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(c) from Defendant.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray that judgment be entered against Defendant, and Plaintiffs be awarded damages from Defendant, as follows:

COUNT I

FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

15 U.S.C. §§ 1692 ET SEQ.

- 41. An award of actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- 42. An award of statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a) (2)(A);
- 43. An award of costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3).

COUNT II

ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

CAL. CIV. CODE §§ 1788-1788.32

- 44. An award of actual damages pursuant to California Civil Code § 1788.30(a);
- 45. An award of statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(b);
- 46. An award of costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees, pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(c).

TRIAL BY JURY

47. Pursuant to the seventh amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, Plaintiffs are entitled to, and demand, a trial by jury.

Date: March 23, 2009

Hyde & Swigart

Joshua B. Swigart

Attorneys for the Plaintiffs

27

28

SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REPUBLISHED)

the civil docket sheet. (SEE IN	STRUCTIONS ON THE REVER	SE OF THE FORM)		•	1 1			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS	1 1 1.				
Mark and Lori Roberts	3		CMRE Financial Services 09 MAR 23 PM 1: 11					
	of First Listed Plaintiff <u>Sc</u> CEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CAS		County of Residence o		Orange			
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Hyde & Swigart 411 Camino Del Rio S	Address, and Telephone Number		o _	Attorneys (If Known)	V 0 578	MMANLS		
II. BASIS OF JURISD						Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff		
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government No		((For Diversity Cases Only) P7 on of This State	rf def	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF ncipal Place □ 4 □ 4		
□ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	① 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship	of Parties in Item III)		Citizen of Another State 🔲 2 🗍 2 Incorporated and Principal Place . 🗍 5 🗍 5 of Business In Another State				
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗍 3 Foreign Nation	06'06		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			1		D. Mariniman	OTHER CEATURES		
□ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterane) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Forecloane	315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 5350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 540 Other Personal Injury CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 444 Weffare 445 Amer. w/Disabilities- Employment	PERSONAL INJUR 362 Personal Injury- Med, Malpractic 365 Personal Injury- Product Liability 368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIO 510 Motions to Vacat Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General 535 Death Penalty	Y	O Agriculture O Agriculture O Other Food & Drug O Tair Labor Mgmt. Relations O Cocupational Safety/Health O Other LABOR O Fair Labor Standards Act O Labor Mgmt. Relations O Labor Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act O Railway Labor Act O Cher Labor Litigation Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act IMMIGRATION Notation Application Heas Corpus Alien Detainee O Other Limmigration Actions	BANKRUPTCY 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY 361 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS 70 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendam) 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	OTHER STATUTES 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Ommodities/ Exchange 375 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 \$90 Other Stabilization Act 391 Agricultural Acts 992 Economic Stabilization Act 393 Environmental Matters 394 Energy Allocation Act 295 Freedom of Information Act 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes		
R1 Original 2 Re	ate Court A	Appellate Court	Reo	pened anoth	ferred from 6 Multidistrer district Litigation			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON Brief description of cat		are ming	(Do not the jurisaithon	al statutes unless diversity):			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS I UNDER F.R.C.P.	IS A CLASS ACTIO 23		emand \$ 75,000	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	if demanded in complaint: : S Yes O No		
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	' (See instructional:	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER			
DATE 3/23/09		SIGNATURE OF A	TTORNEY	OF RECORD				
RECEIPT # 161297	MOUNT 350.	APPLYING IFP		INDGE -	MAG. JU	DGE		

CAGINAL

CP

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO DIVISION

161297 - SR * * C O P Y * * March 23, 2009 13:15:49

Civ Fil Non-Pris

USAO #.: 09CV0578

Judge..: MICHAEL M. ANELLO

Amount.:

\$350.00 CK

Check#.: BC#2968

Total-> \$350.00

FROM: ROBERTS V. CMRE FINANCIAL CIVIL FILING